DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 279 904 CE 046 699

AUTHOR Rezabek, Dale J.; Saul, A. Christine
TITLE Preparing Californians to Work: A Local Perspective on JTPA and Education Coordination.
INSTITUTION California State Council on Vocational Education, Sacramento.
PUB DATE 10 Oct 86
NOTE 34p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cooperative Planning; *Coordination; *Educational Cooperation; Educational Objectives; *Job Training; Models; Postsecondary Education; Program Administration; Program Implementation; *School Business Relationship; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *California; *Job Training Partnership Act 1982

ABSTRACT

A study examined five local work training programs in California that have combined resources from both the federal Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) and the public education system. The programs studied are located in San Diego County (Ramona), Montebello, San Francisco (Chinatown), Shasta County, and southeast Los Angeles County. In these programs, local operators have used three basic approaches to implement coordinated programs: negotiation of contracts using JTPA "8 percent" monies, which permit programming outside of usual performance contract constraints; identification of common goals; and delineation of service function combined with an integration of complementary service capacities. The three approaches are not mutually exclusive, however, and appear in all five programs to varying degrees. Although the study shows that coordination can work, it also presents anecdotal evidence explaining why cooperative JTPA/education efforts generally do not succeed. Despite federal and state attempts to identify common goals across JTPA and occupational education programs, many local JTPA and occupational education program operators perceive their missions to be fundamentally different. JTPA program personnel generally view federal- and state-specified performance standards as mandates for cost-effective programming oriented mainly to employer needs. Educators, on the other hand, place more emphasis on meeting student developmental needs than on achieving specific placement and cost-per-placement outcomes. (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED279904

PREPARING CALIFORNIANS TO WORK:
A LOCAL PERSPECTIVE ON JTPA AND EDUCATION COORDINATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PREPARED BY:
DALE J. REZABEK
A. CHRISTINE SAUL

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Wills

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CALIFORNIA STATE COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
OCTOBER 10, 1986

CE046699

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CALIFORNIA STATE COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

PURPOSES

Mandated by Congress and the California Legislature, the Council is charged with:

- **Evaluating** the adequacy and effectiveness of public vocational education programs and services at the state and local levels
- **Assessing** the distribution of federal vocational education funds between secondary and postsecondary programs
- **Advising** the Board of Education and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges on matters pertaining to the planning, coordination, and implementation of vocational education programs
- **Recommending** needed improvements for vocational education programs and services to the Governor, the Legislature, governing boards, commissions, and agencies

MEMBERSHIP AND AREAS OF REPRESENTATION

The California State Council on Vocational Education is comprised of 13 knowledgeable, dedicated citizens interested in and committed to the improvement of vocational education programs and services. Members are appointed by the Governor of California as prescribed in federal and state law.

EDWARD KEITH BUSH, Council Vice President, San Jose
Career Service Administrator, East Side Union High School District
Secondary vocational institutions

CHRISTINE DICKSON, Bakersfield
Suffolk sheep breeder
Private sector - agriculture

MARTIN C. DODELL, Council President, Rancho Palos Verdes
Account Executive, Crane Packing Company
Private sector - business and industry

VICTORIA EGRY, San Francisco
Economic Analyst, Pacific Bell
Private sector, business and industry

MANUEL FERNANDEZ, Stockton
Counselor, Child Welfare and Attendance, Stockton Unified School District
Secondary vocational institutions - career guidance and counseling organizations

RICHARD HARDEN, San Leandro
Representative, International Association of Machinists
Private sector - organized labor

RICHARD L. KELLEY, Rocklin
Consultant, Chase Financial Group
Private sector - small business

HEBERT LESLIE McCABE, JR., Merced
Instructor, Agriculture Education Merced College
Postsecondary vocational institutions

CARYL J. MILLER, Long Beach
Education Coordinator, Orange County Department of Education
Secondary vocational institutions - special education

BARBARA PEARSON, Dana Point
Director, Equal Opportunity/ Affirmative Action, University of Southern California
Private sector - State Job Training Coordinating Council

ROBERT PILE, Ukiah
Associate Dean of Education, Mendocino College
Postsecondary vocational institutions

LARRY ROBINSON, JR., Bakersfield
Professor and Counselor, Bakersfield College
Postsecondary vocational institutions

BRAD THAM, San Francisco
Business Representative, Teamsters Local 856
Private sector - organized labor

STAFF: Thomas M. Bogetich
Executive Director
Chris Saul
Assistant Director
Judy Gull, Staff Analyst
Dale J. Rezabek, Research and Evaluation Consultant
Mildred May, Secretary

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Executive Summary	i
Commendations and Recommendations	iii
Introduction	1
Coordinated Work Training in California:	
The Policy Context	2
The Process of Coordination:	
Local Views on Issues and Problems	6
The Process of Coordination:	
Model Programs	11
San Diego County/Ramona	11
Montebello	13
San Francisco/Chinatown	15
Shasta County	17
Southeast Los Angeles County	19
Glossary	22
State Council Publications	23

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The populations targeted under both the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) and Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act, and served by those and other categorical programs such as adult education and special education, are often the same. Nonetheless, there has been a long history of infighting among those "categorical" systems about whose approach is best, most human, or most accountable. These quarrels largely serve the territorial interests of the respective bureaucracies, while they result in disservice to the people who need work training. Participants may pass from one program to another in a series of fragmented, poorly articulated, and sometimes mutually opposing "helping" activities, gaining an ever-increasing sense of failure and dependency. Other potential participants may not get served at all.

Much more sensible, humane, and accountable, from the point of view of people who need services, would be the determination by the various delivery systems of their respective areas of expertise and of their particular contribution within a coordinated and comprehensive effort to meet the needs of clients. The State Council on Vocational Education (SCOVE) believes that the recent welfare reform legislation (Greater Avenues for Independence - GAIN) and recent initiatives on youth programming by the State Job Training Coordinating Council (SJTCC) promote a policy context for such program coordination. We applaud these policy initiatives and challenge the education and employment training systems to take these opportunities to realign themselves as collaborative, mutually reinforcing partners in a participant-centered occupational preparation delivery system.

This report describes five local work training programs in California that have combined resources from both the federal Job Training Partnership Act and from the public education system. By doing so, they have avoided or overcome certain program constraints in order to better serve their clients. These examples show that coordination is possible and demonstrate how agencies cooperatively can provide work training services. Local operators have used three basic approaches to implement coordinated programs: negotiation of contracts using JTPA "8%" monies that permit programming outside of usual "performance" contract constraints; identification of common goals; and delineation of service function combined with an integration of complementary service capacities. These approaches are not mutually exclusive, and occur in the five programs to varying degrees.

While this study shows how coordination can work, it also presents anecdotal evidence that explains why cooperative JTPA/education efforts generally do not succeed. Local program managers assured us that fundamental obstacles to coordination still pervade local programming. Despite federal and state attempts to identify common goals across JTPA and occupational education programs, many local JTPA and occupational education program operators perceive their missions to be fundamentally different. JTPA program personnel view federal- and state-specified performance standards as mandates for cost effective programming oriented primarily to employer needs. Educators place more emphasis on meeting student developmental needs than on achieving specific placement and cost-per-placement outcomes.

Differences in perceived goals, coupled with different fiscal and evaluation categories and procedures, impede coordinated contracting. Educators attest that fixed-cost performance based contracting discourages many Service Delivery Areas (SDA's) and JTPA contractors from implementing innovative programs, since innovations involve costs and risks that might lead to failure in meeting performance standards. JTPA personnel, on the other hand, consider education's fixed salary costs and insistence on total cost reimbursement regardless of outcome prohibitively expensive and counterproductive to the training of job-ready workers.

The general conversion of curricula to a competency-based format, which is occurring in both job training and occupational education, might appear to draw the two systems together. However, competition and conflict result from this change more often than collaboration and identification. The systems tend to interpret competency organization differently: in education, as a guide for individually paced incremental learning; in JTPA, as a time-framed accountability mechanism. Competency-based curriculum development ranges greatly in meaning, process, quality, and use from institution to institution, within the JTPA and education systems.

While many local educators and employment trainers use JTPA, Title II-A, coordination funds ("8%" funds) to reduce education/JTPA differences, 8% funding does not completely resolve, and in some cases aggravates, the gap between the two systems. These 8% funds sometime generate competition for dollars between the very agencies who need to collaborate. Since 8% funding sometimes serves as a way to evade fundamental JTPA/education differences, it may discourage state and local systems from substantively integrating their policy, planning, and operational activities. Furthermore, the targeting of half of the 8% dollars to the Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN) program supports JTPA/education coordination for GAIN clients, but decreases availability of specially designated funds for general coordination. (GAIN requires work training for certain welfare recipients.) General coordination of JTPA and education programs, therefore, demands that the cooperative practices that currently exist in 8%-funded programs, also be generally possible in other Title II-A ("78%"-funded) programs.

Finally, though the study focused on the horizontal coordination between JTPA and education, local operators often emphasized problems along the vertical coordination axis between local and state agencies. SDAs in particular criticized state JTPA and education efforts, alleging too much state emphasis on compliance with state goals and too little emphasis on helping local managers foster programs that meet local needs.

These summary comments represent how a group of successful program operators describe their particular situations and their perceptions of the general JTPA/education coordination in the state. While this descriptive evidence cannot support generalizations about the nature of JTPA/education programming in California, SCOVE believes the qualitative insights of these "experts in the field" support a series of recommendations to state policy groups.

COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SCOVE commends the State Job Training Coordinating Council for commissioning the Special Subcommittee on Youth and for endorsing that committee's report and recommendations. The State Council on Vocational Education supports the SJTCC's recommendations, particularly those that advise adjustment of performance standards so that more comprehensive competency-based, basic and pre-employment education can be provided to "at-risk" youth. That action, coupled with State Job Training Partnership Office (JTPO) aid to SDAs who have requested help with adjusting performance standards, makes clear that state employment training managers encourage SDAs to adjust performance standards and so permit more costly and longer-term programming for people with special needs.

SCOVE recommends that the SJTCC assess the extent to which SDAs are aware of flexibility in performance standards and technically are able to request and design needed changes. Models developed by JTPO for adjusting performance standards should be disseminated to SDAs and adequate state technical assistance should be made available to SDAs needing to request adjustments. These activities will relax some of the rigid distinctions between JTPA and education deliverers and will ease current contracting difficulties.

SCOVE recommends that the SJTCC work together with state education policy boards to identify and then disseminate to local work training agencies those curriculum packages that provide substantial job-oriented competency-based pre-employment, work maturity, basic skills, and job-specific education. We urge the SJTCC to promote models that build job readiness and discourage insubstantial workshops merely written in competency format.

SCOVE commends the State Board of Education and the State Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges for the technical assistance provided to local educators by the State Department of Education, Employment Preparation Division and the Employment Training Unit in the State Chancellor's Office.

SCOVE recommends that in future technical assistance, the employment training units in the state education agencies continue to help local educators improve contract design and negotiation skills. We urge state personnel to disseminate models and approaches (like the San Diego Regional Employment Training Consortium work experience contracting model) that meet the needs of both JTPA and education systems in cooperative programs.

In addition, SCOVE recommends that the State Board of Education and the State Board of Governors charge their vocational, adult, and special education units to actively promote JTPA/education and intra-segmental education coordination practices and to help local educators implement those practices. Recent work-group activity in the Department of Education on an agency-based assessment model, in which adult, vocational, and special education units coordinated their activities with each other and with the Employment Preparation Division, is a rare example of such an effort.

SCOVE recommends additional cooperation among state education programs, and between state education and employment training agencies, to design an articulated statewide system for delivering employment preparation. This should go beyond collaboration in the drafting of plans. Policy should outline basic process parameters and core content areas of occupational preparation programs so that participants can select from different delivery systems a compatible and mutually reinforcing set of work training services.

In particular, this system should identify and disseminate fully developed, high-quality curriculum resources. It should identify underdeveloped curricular areas and then develop and disseminate improved materials. We identify curriculum as a particular area of focus because curriculum ultimately determines the knowledge, understanding, and values that participants receive in work training. Extensive competency-based curriculum development by state-level adult and vocational education programs in the last several years have made "competency-based" the curriculum byword in most local education agencies. JTPA has engendered a similar trend in employment training programs. Yet many curricula called "competency-based" and "employment-oriented" are incomplete. Some contain only competency lists and exclude other critical elements, such as standards of attainment and criteria and devices for standard measurement. Nor do all curricula demonstrate clear linkage between specified curricular competencies and functional job-market needs.

Finally, SCOVE recommends that the SJTCC actively help develop the process tenets and curriculum cores for a comprehensive occupational preparation system. This will enable the SJTCC to help its local delivery agencies integrate effective curricula into program delivery or to coordinate efforts with educational agencies who offer fully developed competency-based instruction.

Our goal is to promote a coordinated state system of occupational preparation where participants receive articulated, complementary, non-duplicative services that help them get and keep jobs. We encourage state policy groups to support local latitude in programming by establishing a flexible, coordinated framework for occupational preparation supported by compatible fiscal, program design, and evaluation provisions. We urge policy groups to develop a comprehensive bank of high-quality training materials, useable across delivery systems, and to make these generally available to local JTPA and education agencies.

INTRODUCTION

Employment training programs and vocational education have developed as separate and often conflicting institutions. For over 15 years the California State Council on Vocational Education (SCOVE) has advocated the need for employment training and vocational education to work together, as collaborative, mutually reinforcing segments of an overall occupational preparation delivery system. In this report the Council examines the perceived opposition between the two groups in California, and shows how state policy as well as local programs attempt to develop middle ground between the two systems.

The report first provides a brief overview of state policy trends. We then outline the perceptions, issues, and problems that local program personnel identify as the most important impediments to coordination. Next we describe five local programs that pool resources to better serve participants. Finally, the report lists the Council's recommendations to further improve coordination between employment training and education. (We have appended the recommendations to the executive summary which precedes the text.)

Our analysis of state policy comes from a review of state planning and reporting documents as well as from interviews with state and local program personnel. Interviews with local program operators and with state personnel helped identify coordination issues and obstacles. Our description of local approaches emerges from program visits and from interviews with local program operators.

We identified the five local programs described here by asking state and regional education and job-training personnel responsible for coordination to identify programs that have been particularly effective in pooling resources. In selecting sites, the Council employed a broad interpretation of the term "vocational education." The report examines an array of education resources related to employment preparation, including categorical vocational and adult funds as well as general apportionment funds. Our target programs occur in a range of local delivery systems: secondary and adult schools, community colleges, Regional Occupational Programs/Centers (ROP/Cs), and community based organizations.

This report emphasizes local coordination issues and approaches, not State data and activities. Other state reports already summarize and analyze statewide expenditures and outputs as well as State administrative activities to promote coordination (see sources [1] and [2] in Table 1, Page 2). SCOVE's purpose in conducting this study follows from our conviction that program participants will receive comprehensive and articulated services from local organizations only if these organizations have the latitude, resources, and will to cooperate. We therefore want to communicate information about successful local approaches to other local program operators. We also want to communicate critical commentary from successful local managers to the State policy makers responsible for promoting coordination.

COORDINATED WORK TRAINING IN CALIFORNIA: THE POLICY CONTEXT

Section 10521 of the California Unemployment Insurance Code identifies 29 separate programs that prepare people for work in California. The two major direct work training deliverers, the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), and vocational education in the K-adult, ROP/C, and community college systems, budgeted over $1.2 billion in program year 1984-85 (see Source 1, Table 1). Table 1 shows that the JTPA program, which actually expended over $326 million in California during 1984-85, served over 157,000 participants that year. That same year vocational education in the secondary adult and ROP/C system expended over $551 million in federal, state, and local funds and served over 900,000 persons. Vocational education in the community colleges expended over $423 million in federal, state, and local funds and served over 965,000 persons.

Table 1
Statewide Expenditures and Enrollments by Occupational Preparation Delivery System

Delivery System	Expenditures	Enrollments
JTPA(1)	$326,022,823	157,065
Vocational Education (secondary, secondary adult, and ROP/C) (2)	$551,246,646 *	945,769 **
Vocational Education (California Community Colleges)(3)	$423,442,739 *	965,574 ***

Sources: (1) Annual Report to the Legislature on the Effectiveness of the Family Economic Security Act Program. Sacramento, CA: Employment Development Department. February, 1986.

(2) California Vocational Education Accountability Report, 1984-85 (Preliminary Draft). Sacramento, CA: State Department of Education and Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges. 1986.

(3) Same as (2) above and Vocational Education Data System, 1984-85 Enrollments, Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges. May 9, 1986.

* Preliminary expenditure report; estimated data
** May contain duplicated counts; actual data
*** Actual data: includes 35,000 without programs identified, 35,543 in consumer homemaking, 45,563 estimate for two colleges that have not submitted reports.

Chart 1
Employment Training and Work Education in California: the Federal, State, and Local Players

	Employment Training	Vocational Education
Federal Authorizing Legislation	Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) P.L. 97-300	Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984 P.L. 98-524
State Governance	State Job Training Coordinating Council	State Board of Education; Board of Governors, California Community Colleges
State Administration	Job Training Partnership Office; State Department of Education in conjunction with Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges (8% only)	State Department of Education; Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges
Local Governance	Private Industry Councils/ Service Delivery Areas	Local Boards of Education; Local Community College Boards
Local Administration	Private Industry Councils/ Service Delivery Areas; Community based organizations; Local education agencies o K-adult o ROP/Cs o CCCs	Local education agencies o K-adult o ROP/Cs o CCCs

The involvement of several separate state and local delivery systems (see Chart 1) in serving over two million people per year with such a volume of dollars and resources demands a high level of interagency cooperation to prevent duplicated and fragmented delivery. The Job Training Partnership Act and the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act (VEA - the source of vocational education funds which heavily influence how state and local vocational education dollars are spent) call for coordinated planning and programming across the two systems. Such coordination is a long-term federal objective stated in prior job training and vocational education legislation (Comprehensive Employment Training Act - CETA, and the Vocational Education Act amendments of 1976).

First, the Carl Perkins Act requires the state's vocational education plan to include procedures for coordinated planning and programming between the JTPA and vocational education systems at both state and local levels. The Act stipulates that one member of the State Council on Vocational Education also must be a member of the State Job Training Council. In addition, it requires the State Council on Vocational Education to report on JTPA/VEA coordination every two years.

Likewise, JTPA requires the State Job Training Coordinating Council (which includes state education agency representatives) to develop coordination criteria for required state and local planning. The Act mandates a plan for coordinating all employment training activities in the state. The Act also requires each Service Delivery Area (SDA - the local administrative body created by JTPA) to submit a plan jointly designed by all local employment training and work education deliverers. Local plans must show how local agencies will work together in cooperative program delivery.

JTPA allocates 78% of its primary job training funds (Title II-A) to SDAs for providing job training services. The state directly administers other Title II-A funds, including "8%" dollars (8% of Title II-A) designated for linking local education agencies (including community-based organizations and private schools) and JTPA Service Delivery Areas. In California in 1984-85, 8% "coordination" dollars totalled $16 million. The Employment Preparation Division of the State Department of Education, in conjunction with the Employment Training Unit in the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges administer these funds, allocating 50% to SDAs via formula, awarding 30% to SDAs and local education agencies for special projects via Requests for Proposal, and using 20% for state administration and technical assistance.

Programs funded by these monies directly served over 4,400 participants in 1984-85. More important, these programs helped link the State's JTPA and other occupational preparation efforts. These coordination initiatives promote better and more comprehensive services for all JTPA and occupational education students. They also increase the likelihood that persons in need of services but not currently participating will gain access to employment preparation.

Recent California policy calls for more extensive coordination of JTPA and education programs. Although these directives maintain the current emphasis on joint planning, they also explicitly mandate cooperative effort at the local program level. The first of these initiatives emerges from deliberations on "at-risk" youth; the second results from legislative and gubernatorial proposals for welfare reform.

"At-Risk" Youth

There has been alarm in recent years about increasing school dropout rates and about the fate of dropouts in the job market and society. In 1985, the State Job Training Coordinating Council (SJTCC) organized a subcommittee to examine the employment training needs of "high-risk" youth -- those who are most likely to drop out of or fail in school and the job market.

In late 1985 the Committee reported to the SJTCC that training high-risk youth for employment requires more than just technical skills instruction and placement services. These youth need basic, remedial education, including literacy skills and vocational English as a second language. They also need extensive instruction and counseling in work maturity and pre-employment skills.

The Committee's recommendations prompted the SJTCC to ask SDAs to give priority to enrolling at-risk youth and to providing these youth with more comprehensive and longer term services, including basic education skills. The SJTCC recommended that performance standards for evaluating JTPA program effectiveness be altered to allow for more costly, long-term service delivery. To encourage SDAs to respond, the Council targeted one million dollars incentive funding to SDAs that serve high-risk youth populations. As SDAs respond to these policy initiatives, they may coordinate more of their programming with programs occurring within education agencies.

GAIN

In Fall of 1985, the California Legislature passed a welfare reform bill (AB 2580) called Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN). GAIN requires welfare recipients with no children under age 6 to participate in employment-related training that will lead them to unsubsidized jobs. GAIN provides for a comprehensive package of assessment, counseling, placement, skill training, basic education (including vocational English as a second language) and subsidized employment experience services. The legislation requires state and local welfare assistance, employment training, and education agencies to coordinate their programming and give priority to GAIN participants. While the State Department of Social Services administers the program, the SJTCC, the State Department of Education, the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges, and the Employment Development Department all share responsibility for state-level program planning and support. Locally, county welfare agencies will administer the program, but county offices of education, ROP/Cs, adult schools, the community colleges, and JTPA Service Delivery Areas will coordinate their programs to help GAIN clients secure and retain unsubsidized jobs.

Both the at-risk youth and GAIN initiatives challenge the rapid skill training and placement orientation characteristic of current employment training efforts. They also implicitly challenge "education-for-education's sake" that places too little emphasis on the employment relevance of curriculum. These initiatives lay the groundwork for a middle ground between severely time constrained, outcome-oriented employment training on one hand, and "seat-time" generated education with relatively minor time constraints on the other. The policy directives integrate comprehensive assessment and basic and pre-employment education into employment skills and placement-oriented training. The aim is to accomplish this integration, not through the development of new service components or by the establishment of new bureaucracies, but by demanding that service capacities already existing in different systems work together.

THE PROCESS OF COORDINATION: LOCAL VIEWS ON ISSUES AND PROBLEMS

Given the increased emphasis on coordinated programming in state policy, we identified five local programs that had pooled resources from different systems in order to offer more comprehensive services. We talked with local agency personnel about the obstacles they faced in coordinating programming and about the solutions they developed to overcome the obstacles. These coordination issues and problems follow, with descriptions of the models used in each site to resolve the issues and organize cooperative program activities.

Though local program operators discussed a wide range of issues and problems, they generally commented on four main topics. First, a fundamental block to coordination is the perception by both education and JTPA personnel that their respective systems seek opposing goals. This perceived difference in goals directly relates to two other areas of controversy: contracting format and competency-based education. Finally, local deliverers commented on the effect of state policy and administrative initiatives on coordination, criticizing some state efforts as counterproductive.

Perceived Differences in Goals

We asked local JTPA and education personnel to describe how managers in the two systems typically viewed themselves and each other. In the programs we studied, JTPA program managers generally see themselves as offering short term employment training that meets the needs of employers, that matches participants to already existing jobs, and that enhances participants' specific job skills when necessary. JTPA seeks to place program participants in unsubsidized employment, expending as little time and money as possible, providing only the minimal services needed to train a job-ready worker. Delivery approaches vary greatly but concentrate on job search preparation, short term and intensive classroom and on-the-job training, and direct placement services.

Educators, on the other hand, generally allege that JTPA programs offer insubstantial "quick fixes" and select only the most able clients to receive services. Educators believe JTPA so orients itself to employer concerns and already existing jobs that the programs fail to develop clients' human and work potential, especially for the most needy clients.

Educators consider themselves to be offering long-term, comprehensive education services with development of human potential as the paramount objective. They focus on the "total" person. They attempt to build or enhance a wide range of capacities, believing that an individual with comprehensive basic skills will find an appropriate job and perform adequately. While many ROP/C and secondary vocational educators train students for specific jobs, they often do so in an academically constrained educational environment. Delivery approaches vary considerably, though the classroom teaching format predominates. They usually involve long-term contact between students and a series of teachers and counselors who encourage students to perform well within the education system.

In contrast, JTPA personnel often consider educators to be entrenched bureaucrats who keep students in school as long as possible in order to generate "seat-time" based funds to sustain educators' salaries. JTPA personnel believe that educators generally fail to afford students any skills or understanding related to the job market experience that comes after education. The most critical JTPA personnel allege that the schools also fail to provide basic skills education to some of the most "at-risk" populations. They claim that schools not only fail to teach basic skills in job relevant ways, but generally orient instruction to average, not poor, students.

However, some people that we interviewed feel that these generalizations about education and JTPA are exaggerated. They add that these stereotypes constitute the greatest single obstacle to cooperative programming, since they erode trust and communication. These local operators (both educators and employment trainers) have attempted to establish a philosophical middle ground to achieve common ends. They assert the need for both JTPA and education programming that combines economically efficient output and human development. Economic efficiency and human development are not mutually exclusive, they maintain, but are necessary to each other. These managers relate the job-market orientation of job training with education's open-ended individual-development approach, in order to produce people with appropriate work skills who can also succeed in the job market. They insist that the most successful educators and employment trainers in the state already merge the values of human development and job-market relevance.

But other interviewees largely accept the polar characterizations of JTPA and education. Since they reject a philosophical middle ground, they seek more pragmatic common objectives based on contract negotiation and compromise. Their complaints about programming problems indicate that they still resist compromise because of their convictions about fundamental differences between the systems' motives and approaches.

Contracting

JTPA/education program contracts present problems for both systems. In addition to perceived differences in goals, the systems have dissimilar bureaucratic procedures. JTPA funds programs by means of performance-based fixed-cost contracts. SDAs fix a market cost for a given service -- e.g., $1,000 per person for a four month word processing training slot. The contract pays portions of that amount as each individual reaches certain benchmarks -- e.g., 20% at enrollment, 30% at 2/3 of the way through the program, 30% at completion, and 20% at placement. The placement benchmark can include specifications on salary at placement and on job retention for given periods. This system of contracting encourages contractors to deliver the outputs upon which SDAs are evaluated. For adults these standards include "entered-employment" rate, cost per entered employment, average wage at placement, and welfare entered employment rate. For youths, the standards include entered employment rate, positive termination rate, and cost per positive termination.

While SDAs may purchase individual slots in training programs, they often contract for class-size programs that serve only JTPA-eligible participants.

In class-size programs, SDAs specify eligibility criteria which contractors must assure all enrollees meet. SDAs also often specify competencies to be learned in the program. Contractors receive payment only for those participants served, and only as they reach the various programming benchmarks.

Though SDAs may be granted an adjustment in their performance standards that take into account hard-to-serve populations, most SDAs have not sought such adjustments. SDAs that achieve performance standards receive incentive money awards; those who fail to meet standards may face state intervention in SDA organization or program/contract design. As a result, most SDAs maximize their likelihood of meeting performance standards by generating placement-oriented programs that are relatively short and low cost and that often exclude those persons who require long-term, comprehensive and costly job preparation.

In contrast, schools operate their financial affairs with a state accounting manual based on line-item categories that reflect operational costs, not system output. Teacher unions, tenure programs, and year-long teaching contracts often incur fixed salary costs in schools regardless of enrollment and output patterns. These factors discourage schools from participating in contracts with no guaranteed return of their costs.

Education often organizes semester-length programs based on curriculum approved at the state level. Schools cannot easily or quickly modify such programs, a fact that makes organization of a one-time class-sized program difficult. Schools sometimes lack specialized recruitment, placement, job development, and follow-up functions, which makes it hard to meet enrollment and placement benchmarks, or incurs costs for setting up extra service capacities.

Competency-based Education

Nationwide, forty percent of JTPA Title II-A funds must be spent on youth. Federal and state officials evaluate those expenditures against the performance standards of "entering employment" rate, "positive termination" rate, and cost per positive termination. JTPA legislation includes attainment of locally developed and approved employment competencies as one of the subcategories of positive termination for youth. Until the passage of the Carl Perkins Act, however, SDAs had to charge the administrative costs for providing youth employment competency instruction to the SDA's 15% administrative limitation. A clause in the Carl Perkins Act permits the administrative costs for fixed-unit price contracts for Youth Employment Competencies (YECs) to be charged to training costs, a convention already allowed for placement-oriented programs. This change in regulation converts YECs into a termination status with a fiscal incentive equal to that of placement-oriented programs. This equalization of fiscal incentives removed what was once a disincentive for SDAs to do YECs programming and has resulted in increased YEC instruction.

The inclusion of educational competencies among JTPA termination goals has played a dual role in JTPA's relationship with education. On the one hand, recognition that learning is a desirable end in and of itself for youth attenuates JTPA's otherwise predominate "placement" orientation. The use of competency attainment as a performance criterion permits JTPA to contract,

even on fixed-cost basis, for something education feels it can offer: student achievement within a competency-based curriculum. The focus on competency acquisition also increases the participation of students who JTPA personnel may not consider easily trained or placed in a job. Interest in competency learning makes JTPA more "education-like" in its delivery. It establishes a common ground for JTPA and education to collaborate in designing and implementing four curriculum areas defined as youth employment competencies: pre-employment skills, work maturity skills, basic education, and primary job specific skills. The differences between JTPA and education goals and contracting procedures, however, often erode this potential for collaboration.

Some JTPA personnel allege that many education institutions do not employ true competency-based curricula. Many schools, they insist, have competency lists but lack competency standards and measuring devices. Furthermore, competency lists often do not emerge from a current job market-based analysis of skill needs. As a result, some SDAs have attempted to set up their own delivery capacity in job-specific, pre-employment, and work maturity skills, and even in basic education. SDAs have begun to develop their own competency lists and curricula, which they include as requisite portions of training contracts. In other cases, SDAs have contracted with education to develop and deliver competency-based curricula, but have imposed a time frame on the competencies, claiming that a time constraint is necessary to assure accountability under the JTPA performance system.

Educators claim that JTPA personnel, despite their criticism of educational competency-based curricula, lack the experience and training in curriculum issues to do meaningful curriculum criticism, development, or implementation. Educators further accuse JTPA of duplicating already developed educational curricula. School managers also allege that JTPA use of time-framed competencies as normative indicators of success and failure subverts the original use of criterion-referenced competency curricula as qualitative guides for incremental, functional learning. Educators claim that SDAs seek little or no educational input as they develop competency packages, nor do many Private Industry Councils include a public education representative.

Educators admit that JTPA's interest in competency curricula has made JTPA programs more similar to education programs. But they add that this adaptation at the same time makes curricula more closely resemble lists of quantifiable and measurable output criteria. School personnel caution that what SDAs categorize as competency-based curricula may range from substantial competency instruction to short workshops based on "competency lists". Such workshops, some educators warn, may add little to participants' job preparedness; yet, depending on SDA interpretation of eligibility statutes, they may make participants ineligible for further and more substantive JTPA training because a "positive (YEC) termination" may already appear on their records.

State Coordination Efforts, State/Local Relations, GAIN

Local JTPA and education managers agree that 8% coordination funds have encouraged JTPA-education cooperation. The ability to spend those funds outside the constraints of the performance standards incumbent in other JTPA spending, as well as outside the geographical boundaries of SDAs, have allowed local managers to establish creative programs, combine resources, and serve populations more difficult to serve under regular JTPA guidelines.

Most people we interviewed from local education agencies expressed appreciation for the support given them by the State Department of Education's Employment Preparation Division (EPD). They assert that EPD personnel provided them valuable information on JTPA regulations and program specifications. Educators believe, however, that they need additional technical assistance in the area of contract negotiations and interagency contract design. Several educators criticized other state agency units, including Vocational Education, Special Education and Adult Education, for their lack of encouragement or technical assistance in coordinated program delivery. They feel that most State Department of Education units and planning documents engage in rhetoric about coordinated planning, but do not provide funding or other support to carry it out.

Two SDAs criticized the EPD for making programming more cumbersome. They allege that SDAs plan, design, and implement programs; then, after local agencies do all the work, EPD personnel visit to effect a cooperative agreement. SDAs further complained that State Department of Education fixed grant limits at arbitrary, inordinately low levels and that the degree of paperwork necessary to receive those dollars was out of balance with the amount of funds granted. SDAs criticized the separate and later awarding of 8% dollars for being out of sync with 78% funds. They stated that in the past the EPD's direct awarding to local agencies of RFP 8% funds without adequate consultation with SDAs resulted in duplicated and competitive programs within SDAs.

SDA reaction to SJTCC policy initiatives and to state administrative activities within the JTPO and the EPD ranged from tolerance to resentment. SDAs generally believe, like their educational counterparts, that state coordinated planning efforts are more rhetorical than substantive. A few SDA managers believe that the goal of a quality, unified, and legally compliant state training effort motivates state planning and programming policy. Others indicted state actions, saying they reflect a bureaucratic drive for control that shows little understanding of or interest in local circumstances and needs. Some SDA administrators contended that SDAs should receive all JTPA dollars so that they can administer them in accord with the law as they interpret its application to locally determined needs.

Local program operators said little about the GAIN program itself, since our interviews occurred before the State issued GAIN regulations and before most counties had initiated GAIN planning. Even though the GAIN legislation required 8% funds to be used for GAIN, local JTPA managers generally reacted negatively to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction's targeting of half of the 8% funds to GAIN and the SJTCC's specification that these funds were to provide GED, basic skills, and vocational English as a second language instruction to GAIN participants. Local operators asserted that these funds (over $8 million in 1985-86) provide much of the scarce financial incentive for JTPA/education coordination. According to local SDAs, the loss of those dollars, which support most of the programming that occurred outside the constraints of performance evaluation, threatens coordinated programming in general as well as many particular innovative attempts at cooperation, including some of those highlighted in this report.

Local educators concurred on the importance of 8% monies for implementing coordinated programs. Some, however, contended that the 50% diversion made little difference. They claimed that much of the 50% coordination funding never reached education agencies in the first place, and instead merely augmented regular SDA programming. One local educator welcomed the targeting of the 50% monies to GAIN participants, saying the diversion would assure that SDAs used these monies in activities that required coordinated JTPA/education efforts.

THE PROCESS OF COORDINATION: MODEL PROGRAMS

Differences in goals and contracting formats as well as dissimilar competency-based curricula have generated a range of obstacles to cooperation between local JTPA and education agencies. Nonetheless, some local agencies have overcome those obstacles.

The five local programs described here vary in their mix of program components and in their approach to merging program resources. They have all succeeded, however, in overcoming impediments to cooperation and in implementing a program which combines JTPA and education resources in order to provide more comprehensive services to their participants. The following descriptions detail how programs operate. They also explain how JTPA and education managers merged funds and generally viewed the task of coordinating programs.

San Diego County/Ramona

Students in the Ramona Unified School District participated last summer in the San Diego Youth Corps program. The school district administered the program, funded largely by a JTPA, Title II-B, contract awarded by the San Diego Regional Employment Training Consortium (RETC), but also supported by school district, county ROP, and federal VEA funds.

Ramona, like other Youth Corps contractors, structures its programs in several alternative formats: work crew projects, individual subsidized worksite experience, classroom remediation instruction combined with work experience, or direct job placement in the private sector. In response to RETC's encouragment to increase the development and implementation of work crew projects, however, Ramona centers much of its program on these.

A work crew at the Ramona schools last summer, for example, constructed ramps for the disabled at campus trailers that are used as classrooms and offices. Project participants first received a three-day orientation which included safety instruction, interest and aptitude testing, an introduction to the career and job search resources of the district career center, and pre-employment skills training. Following vocational skills assessment, students received counseling on long-range career goals identification and achievement, an emphasis that pervades the entire program.

Throughout the remainder of the eight-week summer program, students engaged in 30 hours per week of integrated classroom instruction and practical skills application. Classroom instruction included materials on safety, shop math, and design and construction skills. After or in between daily classroom instruction, students applied their new knowledge as they constructed the ramps. An ROP teacher served as both classroom instructor and work site

leader. ROP teachers in this and other work crew projects in the Ramona program organized the intermittent instruction and work experience within a 30 hour work week structure.

Students must be disadvantaged in order to qualify for the Youth Corps program, and therefore tend to be part of the "high-risk" population prone to drop out of school and to fail to find permanent employment. District officials assert that the summer youth employment program vitally complements its school year curriculum and program. After the summer, students return to their regular classes. In many cases, students who participate in the summer program either were previously, or decide to become, vocational and ROP students. The work experience program has proven effective in bringing students back to school, in recruiting them for vocational classes, and in providing disadvantaged students access to ROP classes and programs.

Summer youth employment students who return in the fall as seniors may participate in the school's Jobs for Graduates program, another RETC, JTPA-funded program. In this program, eligible seniors participate in job club activities that improve motivation and prepare students for job market entry. Each student receives a minimum of 30 hours of competency-based instruction and counseling in independent living and survival skills, pre-employment skills, and work maturity skills. The program develops work experience opportunities for eligible students during the school year and places students in full-time, permanent, unsubsidized employment after graduation.

A complex intermingling of funding sources supports the summer youth employment program. JTPA funds provide student wages, the largest single cost item. The JTPA contract and Project Work Ability fund the salary of a special education/ vocational education instructional aide, who provides testing, career counseling, job coaching, and job development services to JTPA and special education students during the summer. VEA disadvantaged setaside funds support this same staff member during the regular school year to provide the same services to vocational and special education students -- many of the same students who participate in summer youth employment. The district places its career center facilities, materials, and other resources at the disposal of summer youth employment participants, and, in addition, pays the salary of the career center director, who serves as the summer youth program director. The county ROP pays the salaries of ROP teachers who serve as work crew leaders and instructors. Students use tools and equipment previously purchased with federal VEA funds throughout their classroom and work experience activities. A VEA sex equity grant has provided inservice training to teachers.

RETC has made it possible for schools to participate in Youth Corps by establishing a complex three stage contracting scheme that combines fixed-cost and cost-reimbursement formats. RETC writes a fixed-cost pre-operational contract that awards monies to the school for planning, recruitment, and work site development. During the operational phase, a cost-reimbursement contract provides the school with protected wage funds and a fixed-cost contract allows the school to earn management fees based on student enrollment and completion.

RETC and Ramona district personnel have organized a successful coordination effort around a common ground of program goals. The school's development capacities and RETC's job world orientation complement each other. RETC personnel stated that the Ramona program provides "a perfect marriage". The school's valuable instructional resources provide prescribed pre-employment skills instruction, as well as job-specific and basic skills curricula. The payment of JTPA-funded wages within a work experience or work project structure ties students' school experience to the world of work and makes the whole program effort accountable.

District officials agree. They believe RETC's emphasis on work-world, employer-oriented curricula and on accountability in programming actually supports vocational educators as they work within the predominate academic environment in schools. The RETC contract format with its guaranteed wages allows the school to participate in the Youth Corps program, while the performance-based portion of the program supports vocational personnel interest in strengthening the employment orientation and job world relevance of their curricula.

Most important, according to Ramona program personnel, is that this combination of school curricula and summer work experience enhances students' opportunities to prepare themselves for successful job entry. Students come to understand the interrelationship of school and work as they realize the academic, technical, and attitudinal skills learned in school are requisite to success in their work experiences. They also come to appreciate that they can both get and do a job if they apply themselves to both their job and related instructional activities. In short, schooling gains added relevance; and work rewards provide students much needed motivation.

Montebello

Montebello Unified School District (MUSD) operates three JTPA , Title II-A 8% grants, each funded by a separate 8% funding pool. The first of these is the Education Cooperative Program (ECP) funded through the 30% RFP funding pool directly administered and awarded by the State Department of Education, Employment Preparation Division, as one-year start-up funding for innovative programs. This program serves actual and potential high school dropouts who need basic skills remediation, vocational training, job placement, or full-time school re-entry.

The district's independent study program recruits most of the ECP participants, who must be concurrently enrolled in the independent study program. The independent study program serves students who work full- or part-time due to financial necessity, who because of a personal situation such as pregnancy or parental disability cannot attend a regular high school, or who have been unsuccessful in continuation or comprehensive high schools. These students usually meet JTPA eligibility requirements and are also actual or potential dropouts. Other ECP student referral sources include Bell Gardens High School and Adult School, Los Angeles County Regional Occupational Programs, and the Youth Services Bureau of the Bell Gardens Police Department.

Once a student expresses interest in the ECP, the independent study teacher contacts the JTPA Occupational and Training Specialist, who meets with the student to determine JTPA eligibility and to initiate an individualized Employability and Educational Development Plan.

Each student takes a series of aptitude, interest, and personality assessment inventories before beginning the program's seven week employability course. The employability course contains modules on career awareness, job preparation, training for the job, and maintaining a job. Students receive information about the world of work, practice exercises such as writing letters for job interviews and preparing resumes, and participate in a review of basic skills for which they receive five units of independent study elective credit. The course also requires that students participate in either a college recruitment or job fair activity.

During the seven week course, students not only attend class, but meet weekly with their instructor individually. The instructor monitors student progress on completing assignments and provides individual counseling and guidance.

The program provides teachers great flexibility in tailoring instruction to individual student need. The instructor may recommend additional course work depending on the age and individual needs of the student once the employability course is completed. Additional instruction may occur within the independent study program (basic skills remediation), the ROP (vocational training), or in the adult school (English as a Second Language classes).

When the student is ready for employment, the JTPA Occupational and Training specialist informs students about available jobs and prepares students for interviews. If at this point the specialist finds that students do not have a social security number, driver's license, or alien registration card, the specialist drives the student to appropriate agencies and helps them obtain whatever identification is required for employment. Once students have obtained proper identification, the specialist helps them prepare a resume and supervises them in simulated job interviews.

The Southeastern Industry Education Council provides initial contact between the program and jobs. Members of the Industry Education Council, which is responsible for ECP follow-up evaluation, provide the job placement office with information about current job openings in their firms as well as other employment opportunities in the community. The Council also promotes the program and recruits students.

JTPA funds support most project staff persons, including partial salary and benefits for the contract independent instructors who teach the employability skills course and for the Youth Services Bureau counselor. JTPA completely funds the costs for the Occupational and Training specialist, who does job development and placement, and for the program administrator. JTPA funds also provide clerical support, books, supplies, transportation, and equipment. District apportionment funds support the remaining salary and benefits for the Youth Services Bureau counselor and the Independent Study Teacher. These combined JTPA and district funds provide the basic program structure which links the resources of six local agencies involved in the program: the

independent study program, the Youth Services Bureau, the adult school, the ROP/C, the Industry Education Council, and Bell Gardens High School.

Another 8% grant funds the district's Motor Vehicle Inspection Program Instructional Class. This grant was awarded to the district by the Los Angeles County Private Industry Council, which administers the 50% portion of 8% monies that are allocated by State Department of Education, Employment Preparation Division, to Private Industry Councils and Service Delivery Areas for local programs. This program provides students with the technical and employability skills to take the Qualified Test and Repair Mechanic's License Examination given by the State's Bureau of Automotive Repair. On passing the examination, students seek employment as qualified, licensed mechanics.

The program is a cooperative JTPA/ROP project. The ROP supplies an instructional aide and materials. JTPA pays for the certificated instructor, books, supplies, and equipment replacement; the licensing exam fee for each student; and most of the smog testing equipment. The district pays for salaries and benefits for a secondary-level curriculum consultant, a portion of a typist's salary and benefits, and a portion of the cost of the facility where the program operates. Federal vocational education dollars fund instructor attendance at inservice conferences, and purchase consumable supplies, computer software, and safety tests. The JTPA office provides job development and placement services for students completing the vehicle inspection program.

Montebello received a third JTPA grant from the 20% technical assistance funding pool administered by the State Department of Education's Employment Preparation Division. This is a research project to identify the characteristics of youth who succeed in jobs and who progress beyond entry-level employment to a primary job market position. The project intends to translate success characteristics into curriculum competencies, establish support systems needed to overcome barriers to employment, and to disseminate these products to other local agencies.

The Montebello district also administers 78%-funded on-the-job training, classroom training, and "exemplary youth tryout employment" programs. Though the district and JTPA consistently have demonstrated the ability to cooperate, district officials contend that 8% monies were the key to initiating the creative projects for dropout prevention and youth job success. The 8% dollars allow both JTPA and school personnel "room to experiment and fail" as they side-step the performance-standard constraints that apply to 78% funds. High risk youth, requiring longer and more costly service than 78% funds could provide, find access to services in the two 8%-funded training programs. Through the 20% funds, the district is able to conduct research that may be critical to improving services, but that would not be an allowable expenditure under either 78% or 8% funds designated for training.

San Francisco/Chinatown

The 4-4 program at the Chinatown Resources Development Center (CRDC) in San Francisco prepares limited-English proficient adults for general and banking/finance clerical positions as well as for technical service jobs. Primarily

funded by JTPA 78% funds, the program also receives extensive in-kind support from the San Francisco Community College District and from private San Francisco employers.

Students must be JTPA eligible to enroll. Initial assessment determines English proficiency and motivation level. Students receive 19 weeks of bilingual occupational classroom training in specific vocational skills and in general employment and job-specific language skills. The program also provides students with extensive job counseling, cultural orientation, job placement, and follow-up support.

The program consists of two phases: a seven week core and a twelve-week occupation-specific curriculum. During the first seven weeks, students learn basic skills needed in any job. Students attend classes six hours a day and receive instruction in English, telephone use, job search and employability skills. Students at intermediate English-as-a-second language level take courses in typing and ten-key calculator operation; students with less proficient English receive instruction in Technical Services Safety and Language. In the latter class students learn about tools, machines, safety, and language essential to service-oriented occupations. During the last week of the core phase, teachers work extensively with counselors to determine the specific jobs students will train for in the second phase of the program.

During the twelve-week occupation-specific portion of the program, students spend four hours a day in the classroom and four hours a day in a job site. Their job site assignment and courses depend on their English proficiency and on their occupational interests and skills. Job site experience is highly individualized and occurs under the close supervision of employers who evaluate trainee progress monthly.

JTPA, which provides primary program funding, supports all in-house staff, including vocational teachers, counselors, and administrators. The San Francisco Community College District, however, provides the teaching staff for nine classroom hours each day. Community college teachers provide instruction in the various ESL classes, as well as in job search and job market procedures, and telephone training. The college district pays the teachers' salaries, and, in turn, receives Average Daily Attendance (ADA) credit generated by the classes. This coordinated program model assures students the extensive language instruction they need to complement their vocational skills training.

Program participants receive the benefits of community college instructional resources which the 4/4 program could not otherwise afford. In addition to an augmented staff of language teachers, CRDC programs benefit from participation of their program personnel in staff development workshops held by the community colleges and from open access to community colleges resource material and personnel.

This is a program coordination model common to other JTPA-funded organizations and programs in San Francisco. It results from long cooperation between the college district, local CETA and JTPA administrators, and community-based organizations that implement JTPA programs. A tangible benefit of this

particular coordination model to the SDA, in addition to expanded services, is the use of the community college in-kind services in regular 78% programs as the local match for JTPA 8% monies spent in the SDA.

Other examples of JTPA and community college coordination include computer instruction labs located in two of the college district centers. In one case, Xerox equipment donated to the SDA is in a college lab for a JTPA-funded, non-ADA generating class. A JTPA-funded teacher instructs only JTPA-eligible students during the day; in the evening, a community college instructor teaches regular college students in an ADA generating class using the JTPA equipment. Similarly, in another center, Wang computers donated to the SDA are available for college use. A college-paid instructor teaches computer use to students in an ADA-generating class into which individual JTPA eligible students may be referred.

This successful coordination results partially because people in the colleges and the SDA have long-term working relationships based on mutual need and respect. The SDA consistently has enlisted credentialled college instructors to provide basic skills, language, and other instruction to complement the vocational skills training and other job-preparation activities in the JTPA programs. This tacit delineation of function has mitigated SDA and college district competition and has mutually benefitted both organizations' clienteles with more comprehensive service delivery.

Shasta County

The Shasta County Office of Education administers the Community Placement Project for special education students under a JTPA 8% (50% portion of 8% funds) contract from the Shasta County Private Industry Council. State Work Ability Program funds provide stipends for program participants. The program serves JTPA eligible special education students in the county's schools. After the first year's program over half of the program participants obtained a non-subsidized job.

Eighty to ninety percent of Shasta County's special education students attend ROP classes. This high percentage results from long-term cooperation between the county's ROP and special education programs. Students in the regular special education program receive pre-employment training, vocational skills and academic instruction. They do not, however, have access to subsidized work experience while in school.

The JTPA-funded Community Placement Project supplements regular services offered 11th and 12th grade special education students in ROP classes. Students receive more extensive pre-employment training than they would receive in the regular school program and participate in a "community classroom". Through these program components, other special education students, ordinarily experiencing too many employment barriers to enter ROP classes, gain access to ROP programs and to meaningful job market experience.

The program includes two tracks. Students in the primary track receive extensive assessment before they enter the program, so that program personnel are aware of students' interests, aptitudes, skill strengths and weaknesses. Students receive ongoing counseling and guidance throughout their involvement

in the program. A training specialist develops community classroom sites that match student interests and provide them an opportunity to work in a real job under the supervision of an employer. While they are working in this community classroom, students continue attending their regular and special education classes. In their special education classes they receive concurrent job-related instruction that builds their pre-employment and work maturity skills.

Special education teachers who do the concurrent instruction direct their efforts to the needs of specific students in particular jobs. To accomplish this individual emphasis, they visit the job site of each of their students, discuss with employers the skills required for high job performance, and "shadow" students to assess the current level of competency in each skill area. On the basis of this individual needs assessment, teachers develop and deliver personalized concurrent job-oriented instruction. In this instruction, teachers emphasize academic skills required for the job, job holding or seeking skills, and job-related communication skills, as called for by each student's situation. Special education instructors visit the job sites quarterly to maintain communication with employers and to gather information to update curricula.

In their jobs, students gain awareness, skills, and confidence in their ability to handle a work situation. When students reach a certain level of proficiency or productivity at work, they receive a stipend funded through the County's Work Ability program. The Work Ability program is a coordination effort which pools State Department of Education, State Department of Rehabilitation, and Employment Development Department resources (although EDD resources were withdrawn for 1986-87) to assure special education students an opportunity for job preparation and placement. The Work Ability stipends provide a critical boost to student self-esteem and confidence in their ability to be productive and valued workers.

A second program track provides more extensive work maturity and career exploration to students whose assessments indicate they do not have a level of work maturity to benefit from immediate participation in the community placement project. Students entering this track include alternative school students with severe behavior problems, and pregnant teens or teen mothers who are still unaware of how child-raising will affect their job opportunities. These students complete work maturity components which increase their understanding of employer expectations, build their awareness of why people work, improve their work-related communication skills, and examine how their personal habits, attitudes, interests, and values relate to work success or failure. Subsequently, they participate in "community classroom" and Work Ability programs like the first group of students.

Students who successfully complete the Work Ability component become eligible for on-the-job training and placement available through the PIC. Eligible students throughout the program are concurrently enrolled as JTPA 78% students and therefore receive support services available through the PIC, including transportation assistance, child care, medical and legal services, and training equipment or resource aids.

JTPA 8% funds partially support the Community Placement Project administrative and clerical personnel and completely fund the training specialist responsible for developing, placing, and overseeing students in community classrooms. JTPA 8% funds support assessment activities by program staff and provide transportation support. JTPA 78% monies provide additional support services to students. School district and county special education funds provide program-related concurrent instruction, and county ROP and district funds provide complementary ROP and specific vocational skills instruction.

A VEA sex equity and single-parent homemaker grant has provided personnel to develop work maturity curricula for the second-track students who are pregnant or who are already parents. Finally, employers contribute their supervisory time throughout the community classroom experience.

The County Office of Education and the PIC have dissimilar goals. The PIC's primary goal is economic efficiency in serving the interests of the job market. PIC officials believe JTPA's accountability-oriented performance contracting constraints are both appropriate and necessary. The County Office of Education, on the other hand, prefers a more student-centered, developmental approach to programs.

JTPA and education established the successful cooperative effort described here because both the PIC and County Office of Education actively sought better job preparation services for special education students. The 8% percent funding allowed them to cooperate in planning and implementing the Community Placement Project. Unconstrained by the performance standards and time limitations on work experience attached to 78% funding, PIC officials were able to offer longer-term services to students who could not succeed in a regular program. PIC officials cautioned that the future of the program is uncertain as GAIN priorities erode 8% funding for local coordination efforts.

Southeast Los Angeles County Service Delivery Area (SELACO)

This SDA's Job Search Assistance (JSA) Program, funded with JTPA 78% dollars, targets high-risk populations who have never enrolled in a training program and who may have "slipped through the cracks" of the area's occupation-preparation system.

Each area occupational service provider meets weekly to discuss JTPA-eligible applicants for training. If individual service providers do not offer training programs that meet applicant's needs or if the applicants do not have minimum skills necessary for existing training programs, the service providers release the applicants to a special pool. Here other providers with appropriate services can contact the prospective participants.

For example, an applicant may attempt to enroll in an ROP medical office careers course without sufficient word processing skills. If the ROP does not offer word processing, it releases the client to the pool so that a service provider who does offer word processing can contact the client for enrollment. When a client has been in the pool four weeks without enrolling in a training program, the SDA refers this client to the Job Search Assistance Program operated by Cerritos College and Southeast ROP.

The college informs the client of the program by letter. If the client does not respond to the letter, Cerritos follows-up with telephone calls. When the client responds, Cerritos College will provide him with assessment and career counseling. The Cerritos counselors may also refer the client to community agencies that provide other support. Finally the college will refer the client to a regular training program or to Southeast ROP, which subcontracts with Cerritos College to provide a 20-hour job search workshop.

An ROP job developer paid with JTPA funds conducts the workshop, using a one-on-one teaching approach to coach the client on how to get a job. The job developer, who works in collaboration with Cerritos College's placement services, also finds a job for the client.

The Job Search Assistance Program resulted from a high level of interagency cooperation unique to Southeast Los Angeles County. The SELACO SDA provides job training programs to the residents of Bellflower, Cerritos, Downey, Hawaiian Gardens, Lakewood, and Norwalk. This six-city consortium formed through a series of circumstances that have effectively prevented any conflict or lack of coordination between JTPA and education. In fact the service providers within the SDA and the local education agencies are essentially the same.

Unlike many other SDAs, the area served by SELACO had not been a Prime Sponsor under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA). When area administrators decided to form a JTPA SDA, they created a new structure, one not patterned after conventional CETA or JTPA models.

A Regional Area Vocational Education (RAVE) Council had been operating for years in the area, despite the fact that funding for it had expired several years earlier. The RAVE Council had developed and successfully implemented "delineation of function" agreements between the area community college districts, K-12 districts, adult schools, and two Regional Occupational Programs. Educators, by participating in the RAVE Council, had eliminated "turf battles" and had established cooperative working relationships. The RAVE Council members supported an SDA that would use many of the models developed by the RAVE group.

Thus, the communities established an SDA and formed a PIC, but resolved to avoid the formation of a new bureaucracy. The PIC decided to contract all services to be provided by the SDA to public educational institutions, proprietary schools, and community-based organizations, many of whom were members of the RAVE Council. The PIC contracted with Cerritos College to serve as the administrative entity, with ABC Unified School District to determine JTPA eligibility and to manage the SDA's Management Information System, and with the RAVE Council for outreach and recruitment.

The RAVE Council, through a PIC contract, maintains a computerized index of all educational programs in the SDA. The RAVE Council uses this information bank to recruit participants for JTPA programs. The Council advertises at Employment Development Department offices, city halls, and so on. A simple "tear-off" sheet with the RAVE Council telephone number allows potential

enrollees to contact the office and inquire about programs available. The RAVE Council also developed the employment competencies approved by the PIC for use in youth pre-employment training programs.

Service providers who have long cooperated with each other on the RAVE Council continue to do so under the JTPA structure. The RAVE Council chairman serves on the PIC, and the director of the SDA serves on the RAVE Council. Both directors thus achieve optimum communication and a close working relationship with service providers. As a result, the SDA has effectively eliminated duplication of programs and competition for dollars and students.

Southeast Los Angeles County SDA is an unusual example of what can be accomplished when educational institutions, local government, and community-based organizations work together. SELACO's high level of program articulation assures client access to a comprehensive range of work training services.

GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS AND TITLES

EDD - State Employment Development Department

EPD - Employment Preparation Division of the State Department of Education

GAIN - Greater Avenues for Independence (work training for welfare recipients)

JTPA - Job Training Partnership Act

JTPO - Job Training Partnership Office

PIC - Private Industry Council

RETC - Regional Employment Training Consortium (San Diego)

ROP/C - Regional Occupational Program/Center

SCOVE - State Council on Vocational Education

SDA - Service Delivery Area

SDE - State Department of Education

SELACO - Southeast Los Angeles County

SJTCC - State Job Training Coordinating Council

VEA - Vocational Education Act

VEDS - Vocational Education Data System

STATE COUNCIL PUBLICATIONS

REPORTS:

1 Annual Report, October 1970, 7 pp.

2 A Brief Review of Some Aspects of the Funding Program in California - Vocational Education, January 1971, 12 pp.

3 Feasibility Study of Career Ladder Curriculum and Guidance and Counseling, January 1971, 27 pp.

4 Assessment of Current Status of Regional Occupational Centers and Regional Occupational Programs, January 1971, 27 pp.

5 A Review of the Education Professions Development Act in California, July 1971, 16 pp.

6 Second Annual Report, November 1971, 16 pp.

7 Report of A Survey of Private Vocational Training Schools, 1972, 7 pp.

8 Third Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1971-72, January 1973, 11 pp.

9 Vocational Education and California Indians: A Report Prepared for the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, January 1973, 7 pp.

10 Regional Occupational Centers and Regional Occupational Programs (ROCP's), February 1973, 7 pp.

11 The Present Status of, and Proposed Modifications to, Area Vocational Planning in California, October 1973, 12 pp.

12 Fourth Annual Report: Toward Education Opportunity, Fiscal Year 1972-73, January 1974, 20 pp.

13 Career Guidance in California, Winter 1974, 8 pp.

14 Career Education in California, A Recommended Direction, March 1974, 6 pp.

15 An Examination of the Effectiveness of Target Area Vocational Education Programs for Disadvantaged Persons in the Los Angeles Area, March 1974, 50 pp.

16 A Summary of Proceedings: CACVE Forum, Working Together-Building Together, June 1974, 14 pp.

17 Public Hearing Report, 1973-74, Vocational Education, Public Comment on Programs and Services and Exemplary Practices in Vocational Education, 23 pp.

18 Fifth Annual Report, Vocational Education in California, Fiscal Year 1973-74, December 1974, 23 pp.

19 Summary Report Spring 1975 Conference of Western States Advisory Councils on Vocational Education, April 1975, 20 pp.

20 Student Perspectives on Career and Vocational Education in California, July 1975, 20 pp.

21 Review of the Development and Management of Manpower and Related Information in California Vocational Eduction, December 1975, 24 pp.

22 Sixth Annual Report: Practice Does Not Equal Policy, Fiscal Year 1974-75, December 1975, 24 pp.

23 An Analysis of Vocational Education Policy, December 1975, 45 pp.

24 Review of A Community-Based Youth Employment Service, January 1976, 10 pp.

25 Project Focus: Description and Analysis of Resources and Delivery of Education and Training for Employment in the San Diego Area, February 1976, 40 pp.

26 Executive Summary, "Project Focus", Description and Analysis of Resources and Delivery of Education and Training for Employment in the San Diego Area, February 1976, 4 pp.

27 A Survey of the Effects of the Five Percent Budget Increase Limitation on Adult and Vocational Education Programs and Services, June 1976, 9 pp.

28 Seventh Annual Report, A Call for Action! Fiscal Year 1975-76, November 1976, 14 pp.

29 Barriers and Bridges: Overview of Vocational Services Available for Handicapped Californians, January 1977, 220 pp.

30 A Study of the Allocation of Grants Under the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976 (P.L. 94-482), January 1977, 52 pp.

31 1977 Vocational Education Legislative Conference, A Summary Report, February 1977, 30 pp.

32 A Study of the Governance of Vocational Education: Issues Related to SB 1028, July 1977, 137 pp.

33 Summary Report, CACVE Public Hearings on Governance, October 1977, 5 pp.

34 Eighth Annual Report: A Call for the Question! Fiscal Year 1976-77, December 1977, 24 pp.

35 Coordinated Approach in Delivering Comprehensive Vocational Services: September 1978, 16 pp.

36 Review of the Implementation of Subpart 3 of Public Law 94-482: October 1978, 28 pp.

37 Ninth Annual Report: Vocational Education in California: A Focused Study of Progress Toward Statewide Goals: Fiscal Year 1977-78, December 1978, 38 pp.

38 Study of the Impact of Proposition 13 on Vocational Education: Technical Report: March 1979, 188 pp.

39 Summary Report: A Study of the Impact of Proposition 13 on Vocational Education: March 1979, 36 pp.

40 Review of the BSO 12 Contract Procedure: June 1979, 12 pp.

41 A Guide for Linking Comprehensive Vocational Education Services: December 1979, 97 pp.

42 An Assessment of the Development and Maintenance of the California Occupational Information System: April 1980, 118 pp.

43 Tenth Annual Report, Vocational Education in California; A Focused Study of Progress Toward Statewide Goals, Fiscal Year 1978-79: June 1980, 50 pp.

44 CACVE Analysis of the California Occupational Information System: June 1980, 4 pp.

45 Report to the Legislative Budget Committee: October 16, 1980, 22 pp.

46 Eleventh Annual Report, Vocational Education in California; A Focused Study of Progress Toward Statewide Goals, FY 1979-80, June 1981, 39 pp.

47 Horizon; An Overview of Vocational Education and Employment Training Services for Limited-English Proficient Persons in California: July 1981, 171 pp.

48 Technical Report, Employment Problems and Programs for Inner-City Youth: November 1981, 116 pp.

49 Summary Report, Employment Problems and Programs for Inner-City Youth: November 1981, 18 pp.

50 A Study on Teenage Parenthood and Child Care, March 1982, 22 pp.

51 Twelfth Annual Report, FY 1980-81, June 1982, 47 pp.

52 Thirteenth Annual Report, FY 1981-82, July 1983, 63 pp.

53 California Code Provisions for Vocational Education, September 1983, 265 pp.

54 Fourteenth Annual Report, A Call for Action! ...Comprehensive State Policy for Vocational Education, March 1984, 22 pp.

55 Fifteenth Annual Report, Opportunities for Vocational Education in the Educational Reform Act of 1983 (Senate Bill 813), Alternatives That Satisfy Graduation Requirements, May 1985, 47 pp.

POSITION PAPERS:

1 Education Amendments of 1972

2 Serving the Handicapped, April 1977

3 Vocational Student Organizations, July 1977

4 Apprenticeship, June 1978

5 Sex Fairness, June 1978

6 Legislative Relations, June 1979